DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 203 717 FL 012 405

AUTHOR Hayden, Rose Lee
TITLE Issues in International Education: Exchange Policy.
SPONS AGENCY National Inst. of Education (ED), Washington, D.C. National Council on Education Research.
PUB DATE 29 Apr 81
CONTRACT NIE-P-81-0049
NOTE 43p.: Paper presented at a meeting of the National Council on Education Research (Washington, DC, April 29, 1981).

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Agency Cooperation: Educational Policy: Elementary Secondary Education: Foreign Students: Government Role: *International Educational Exchange: Postsecondary Education: *Research Needs: Second Language Programs: *Student Exchange Programs: *Study Abroad: Teacher Exchange Programs

ABSTRACT

One of 10 studies commissioned to investigate research needs and to stimulate planning activities, this paper looks at the need to examine international exchange policy and practice, the state of the art of research on educational exchanges, and the areas most amenable to serious research attention. Poor record-keeping and uneven analysis have hampered evaluation and research efforts in the field of educational exchange. In addition, the absence of testable hypotheses and generalizable sample data pools have inhibited the emergence of a methodologically sound body of research. The priority areas for research on exchanges which are suggested apply to all sectoral levels of the educational process. The constituency for such research output includes the administrators of exchange programs, college and university faculty, students, and actual or potential donors in the private and public sector. It is suggested that the National Institute of Education, by assuming a leadership role, can, without huge outlays of monies, advance the state of the art on exchanges. Ways to do this are indicated. (Author/AMH)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED203717

RESEARCH AND DISSEMINATION

Issues in International Education: Exchange Policy

By

Dr. Rose Lee Hayden
National Council on Foreign Language
and International Studies

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

I. Introduction

Long concerned with a range of educational research and dissemination issues, the National Institute of Education's new mandate to encompass international education policy areas is good news, particularly for exchange-related programs. Despite a lengthy history of educational travel and study, very little is systematically known about the immediate let alone longer-term educational and personal impact of an international exchange experience.

Immersed in day-to-day operations, program administrators are generally unfamiliar with research efforts pertinent to the more effective conduct of international exchanges. Rising airfares, rather than pedagogical outcomes, are the object of the average practitioner's attention.

For their part, educators and researchers have not demonstrated a flair for investigating one of the most powerful tools on the cross-cultural and foreign language workbench--namely, international exchange. Thus, life-shaping learning experiences overseas are not part-and-parcel of academic or school-based dialogue, and more often than not, such experiences are tangential to the student's mainstream academic experience.

FL012405

As the Walrus said, the time has come to speak of many things, of Peace Corps days and Fulbright stays and an enormous range of endeavors which involve people-moving at all educational levels. The National Institute of education, by placing policy research on exchanges on its overall R & D agenda represents the field's best hope that at last the substance of exchanges as an educational process will be examined in a more coherent fashion. Thus, the time is appropriate for the National Institute of Education to assume a leadership role given these prevalent realities:

- Administrators of exchanges are not able, on the whole, to conceptualize and build sound educational research paradigms, however much these practitioners could improve their programs as a result.
- Educators desiring to advance America's ability to function in an interdependent world would benefit from an increased appreciation of both the potential and limits of international exchange as a means to facilitate the global/intercultural learning process.
- "Consumers" of such exchange programs could assess more adequately just which kind of international experience would most likely enhance their particular learning objective: language acquisition;

intercultural communication skills; cognitive knowledge about a world region or problem, etc.

- Donors (federal and private) would have some means of selecting among proposals those programs of tested pedagogical quality and effectiveness.
- Over time, the National Institute of Education would be able to encourage, by example, the greater professional and financial support of educational research in this area.

For reasons not necessarily clear to any logical observer, those agencies of the federal government charged with sponsoring international research, education and exchanges (e.g., Department of Education, USICA) have been either unwilling or unable to fund educational research with international exchange as its general topic. In USICA's case, after the merger of 1978 which created the Agency, virtually all evaluation and exchange-related research was suspended. It should be noted that such research had never been generously supported in the past.

USICA, as the U.S. agency responsible for "telling America's story" abroad also must respect rigid legislative prohibitions which make it an unlikely donor of any U.S. school-based research and evaluation effort. USICA must keep a certain prudent distance from the actual conduct of education in this nation, and prefers to think of the Department of Education as being responsible for such activity.

While the Division of International Education can sponsor research under its authority (Higher Education Act, Title VI), the amount of its research funds and its staff capability on educational research and dissemination issues are severely limited. With inflation biting into the overall Title VI budget, research receives an ever-lower priority. Not sizable to begin with, the Division's small research budget is very much placed in the service of developing and/or assessing particular language-related matters (e.g., text development for non-Western languages). This is not to belittle the research efforts of the Division, but rather to note that for political and financial reasons, there is no reason to assume that the Division can match the National Institute of Education's claim to leadership in this area.

The educational value of the Institute's sponsorship--both substantive and financial--is evident. First, the Institute can integrate these studies into the mainstream of its concerns and can build on a healthy history of research and dissemination in education at all levels. Second, the Institute can assist educators in the design of more effective international exchanges from the point of view of enhancing their pedagogical and personal impact, or their institutional legitimacy as a principal means for achieving a more internationally competent citizenry. And

third, the Institute can advance its own mandate: (1) to conduct research and dissemination activities designed to improve the American student's ability to function in an interdependent world; and (2) to gather and exchange information with other nations that will be of benefit to the American educational system.

Various constituencies will be the direct beneficiaries of the National Institute of Education's sponsorship of research and dissemination:

- consumers--the hundreds of thousands of students and teachers who travel in search of upgrading their language, area, and cross-cultural abilities;
- institutions--schools, colleges and universities of all types and at all levels who are facing increased financial pressure and must streamline and justify all educational efforts, particularly those related to international educational travel;
- practitioners--administrators at all levels who design and manage international exchange programs;
- educators--individuals who are engaged in the educational struggle to deparochialize our citizenry;
- researchers-scholars whose own methodological and conceptual paradigms would find the challenge of assessing educational and personal impacts of international study experiences to be a real test of their craft; and

- professional groups--hundreds of associations related to the exchange process as either donors, advocates, or implementers (e.g., Rotary International; National Association of Foreign Student Affairs; American Association College Registrars and Admissions Officers; etc.).

In a fragmented field, such as that of educational exchanges, the National Institute of Education can provide the necessary leadership for yet another facet of the process, namely the broader exchange of information about educational practices that affect and improve the international/intercultural education of America's school children and college students. This function can be enhanced by the Institute's ability to draw upon research related to exchanges purposes and to practices of other nations with respect to--

--problems of language acquisition and aspects of language attrition;

--comparative teaching methodologies (ethnopedagogy);

--alternative approaches to disciplines; and

--cross-cultural variations in motivation, cross-cultural adjustment, impact of exchange experience, etc.

A final note is in order. An international exchange experience, it is argued, is a life-shaping event. Just how one's life is shaped at various stages of the educational process (K-12, collegiate, graduate, post-graduate) has not been the topic of much professional attention by the pertinent research community. Any number of hypotheses, not necessarily based on empirical evidence, do seem to bias education practice, and need to be tested, to wit:

- you need at least "two years" of a foreign language to be able to successfully complete a foreign study experience in another language (nation);
- an international immersion enhances positive attitudes toward language learning and affects language acquisition in ways not replicable in the classroom.
- a high school exchange experience is more intense and has a more lasting impact on one's career and personal attitudes;
- students of all ages appreciate the United States more after having lived abroad for a period of time; and
- an international study experience makes the student more cross-culturally empathetic and able to cope with global issues.

The above assumptions are but the tip of the iceberg when it comes to assessing the educational value of an international travel/study experience and suggest the incredible range of legitimate research and dissemination projects which the National Institute of Education could endorse both professionally

and through selected research support.

Having presented, then, an outline of the rationale for the Institute to include research and dissemination issues on international student and faculty exchanges on its agenda for action, it is time to move on to more detailed examination of the current "state of the art" with respect to international exchanges research.

II. A Brief Review of the State of the Art of Research on Exchanges

Like Christopher Columbus, who did not know where he was going when he set out, did not know he had arrived and, upon his return, did not know where he had been, institutions and individuals involved in international exchanges have, more often than would be considered prudent, set sail programmatically without sound educational direction and purpose. Poor record-keeping and uneven analysis have hampered evaluation and research efforts, while the absence of testable hypotheses and generalizable sample data pools have inhibited the emergence of a methodologically sound body of research. This is not to say that hundreds of articles and scores of dissertations do not tackle exchange-related subjects. Indeed, descriptive, ad hoc, post hoc one-shot studies abound. Generally lacking in scientific value, the results of these inquiries are not often disseminated well if at all. Even more often, these findings are incomprehensible to managers and practitioners who should, in any logical universe, be the consumers of such exchanges research findings.

Having surveyed almost 550 publications and studies on international educational exchanges and foreign students, Spaulding and Flack's comprehensive overview study on The World's Students in the United States (New York: Praeger, 1976) reached these conclusions in support of the previous assumptions about the exchanges literature, namely that this literature was

--quantitatively large;

--methodologically uneven;

--conceptually and theoretically unfocused;

--topically wide-ranging but seldom inter-related, in results and findings diverse, sometimes contradictory, and only in some instances significant or original,

--in policy recommendations scattered, ad hoc and unconcerned about implementation; and

--in research recommendations broad, seldom mutually related, encompassing a wide spectrum, and within it emphasizing some recurrent themes while ignoring others.[1]

In a 1980 paper, "Comment on Issues and the State of U.S. Research on International Exchanges," Michael Flack provides an overview of the literature published since 1974-1975.[2] He observes that the number of books entirely devoted to specific analyses, theory development, or overall policy assessment on

international educational exchanges has decreased.

A substantial number of doctoral theses, few ever published, continues to focus on international exchanges and their administration. These studies are primarily prepared in a limited number of academic fields and/or units: Schools of Education; Schools of Public or International Affairs; and programs in Communication, Development, Sociology, and Counselling.

Other major developments in this period include the publication of a number of studies by government agencies, such as the General Accounting Office; the two-volume report of the President's Commission on Foreign Language and International Studies; special issues of major journals, such as the March 1976, March 1979 and May 1980 issues of the Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science; and the appearance of a comprehensive three-volume Bibliography on International Education: The American Experience by Agnes Tysse. William Glaser's international comparative study on The Brain Drain appeared in 1978, and concurrently, considerable public attention was being focused on ethical and other questions related to international study, foreign students, "dependencia" theories, and the like.

Flack mentions that in addition to the above, two high-potential, but only provisionally completed studies deserve further attention: Richard B. Myer's Survey of Less-Developed

Country Alumni of Four Universities in the USA (1979) and Arthur P. Dudden's report on The Fulbright Alumni Association: 1979 Survey.

In Flack's words, then, the conclusion one reaches about the state of the art in international educational exchanges research is that:

> "...basically, the initial characterization offered at the beginning of this paper does not, as of 1980, require major recasting. As before, the period has produced a considerable number of publications--chapters, articles, reports, theses and dissertations, monographs, books. As before, many of them are either responses to perceived operational or membership servicing needs of existing agencies, the often delayed publication of results of studies begun years before, the result of idiosyncratic choices by senior or junior academics to explore some research topic of mostly ad hoc or passing concern to the researcher, or compendia gathering within one cover, or within a special journal issue, papers presented at a professional conference. Many of these are thoughtful and competent. To what extent they exert an intellectual and research impact, given the lack of cumulative approaches we do not know. To what extent some of the findings or recommendations lead to changes in policy or institutional conduct has not been ascertained.
>
> The task of improving, disseminating, and making research on international educational exchanges more effective continues."[3]

Viewed itself as an international, comparative problem, the state of research on international exchanges is the subject of an excellent publication by a German scholar, Diether Breitenbach, "A Critique of Interchange Research."[4] Breitenbach's assessment echoes Flack's, namely that "being rooted in general and undifferentiated questions, most of which never reach the level of precise formulations of hypotheses"

is the characteristic feature of most studies related to problems of education abroad. The field, lacking the research sophistication of most American scholarship, finds itself in the situation of having few if any methodological standards. Thus, data once collected cannot be compared or even interpreted over time.

In an analysis of 262 publications, Spencer and Awe (1970) confirm that the state of the art is a sorry one indeed.[5] Very little research has been done relative to motivation, or to the overt and covert objectives which students and governments have when they undertake or provide opportunity for international study. Most research is local, parochial and non-longitudinal, and those research findings that do exist tend not to transcend the literature and move into the realm of practice. Thus, not much is ever done with findings, nor are they generally subjected to any cross-validation. Lacking adequate funding for research, selection, admissions and instructional programs carried out experimentally as a basis for research are almost totally lacking.

Breitenbach poses several areas which affect the prospects for improving research about international exchanges. He cites difficulties in stating the problem given the complexity and number of simultaneous variables. Research design is weak as scholars have difficulty translating practical problems into scientific questions. Ultimately, researchers must deal with

problems of culture comparison, namely that culture-comparing research cannot limit itself to the mere comparison of external manifestations of human behavior itself, but must deal with transcultural equivalences of behavior in different cultures. Finally, control groups are virtually absent in the research to date, and sampling techniques are, at best, uneven.

It is safe to assume, then, that the need to improve the state of the art in the field of research on exchanges is real. It is also safe to assume that some investment of personnel and resources in this field,at this moment, would yield tangible results. As an increasingly visible and at times controversial phenomenon in education worldwide, progress in measuring the impact of exchanges on learning, on cross-cultural skills, on language acquisition and ultimately on international communication itself would be welcome.

There is reason to be somewhat more optimistic about improving the research and dissemination dimesions of educational exchange. Attention to the issue is mounting, donor interest may be greater, and managers of programs themselves seem to be open to utilizing research findings for the improvement of programming.

III. Some Recent Developments

Several recent events deserve mention before moving to a more specific consideration of specific research and dissemination projects.

In Bonn, Germany in late November, 1980, a conference entitled "Research on Exchanges" was sponsored by the DAAD (German Academic Exchanges Service). Approximately thirty persons participated in this bilateral conference, representing both scholars and practitioners. Projects and follow-up activities for both short-term as well as long-term activities were outlined. Conference proceedings are due to be published in 1981.

The three main areas of concern to the delegates of the Conference were these:

1) The historical and political dimensions of the context of exchanges (research and policy objectives);
2) The theoretical and methodological problems of research on exchanges (the strategy of research); and
3) The relationship between research and practice (definition of research projects and application of research findings).

Two types of research were identified--comparative historical research and descriptive studies of phenomena that inform or should inform policymaking.

Among possible research projects called for by the Conferees as constituting a useful research agenda were these:

- A comparative study of the history of concepts of foreign cultural policy to be undertaken by historians from both countries.

- A comparative study of the terminology in exchanges and its historical development.
- Investigation into the concept and practice of reciprocity in exchange programs.
- Studies on the long-term impact of programs (on the sending society and its organization of educational systems and/or curricular structure; on the host society; on the participants themselves and their "ecologies" etc.)

The participants diagnosed a general lack of conceptualization and a methodological uncertainty in the field of research on exchanges. They identified the need for future research on 1) important concepts to guide future research; 2) specific studies of particular methodological interest and promise; and 3) an infrastructure for present and future work in progress.

New empirical research was called for which would include projects on

--the long-term results of exchanges, making use of the concept of the ecological research unit.

--the social structures of universities and the roles of participants in exchanges.

--the mental health of foreign students and of other populations in exchanges.

--the taxonomy for situational factors in interpersonal relations.

--the bearing of research on other types of major life changes on investigations into educational exchanges.

In addition to initiating some truly comparative, bilateral research projects, the conferees recommended that funds for research and evaluation should be built into budgets for international exchanges and called for more translation of research reports from and into other languages.

The participants designed the following chart as a schematic summary of key concerns for future joint research on academic exchanges:

RESEARCH PROBLEM AREAS AS SEEN BY PRACTITIONERS

SOCIO-POLITICAL	PSYCHOLOGICAL	PEDAGOGICAL	ADMINISTRATIVE
Identification of those involved in exchangeprograms	Motivation of participants and non-participants	Problems of language acquisition	Institutional relations between sponsor and host
Identification of promoters and sponsors and their purposes	Cross-cultural adjustment of the individual	Differneces in teaching methods	Selection admission and registration
Instruments, agencies anc costs of promotion and sponsorship	Relations of individuals with others in the host culture	Differences in approach to the study of a discipline	Pre-departure orientation
Impact on sending and host institutions	Methodology for dialogue at intercultural conferences	Methods and equivalency of academic assessment	Housing and hospitality
Effects of exchange programs on the involved societies	Assistance in reintegration and re-adjustment	Post-experience academic re-enforcement and follow-up.	Health and safety
	Effects of the sojourn on the individual		Library use and information systems
			Community activities and involvement
			Counseling
			Post-program evaluation

A second development has been the establishment of a Task Force on Information and Research under the general auspices of the International Education Liaison Group. This group consists of sixteen organizations which have joined forces to advocate international exchanges, to share experiences, and to promote improvements in both theory and in operational practice. Members of the International Educational Exchange Liaison Group are listed below so as to provide a more adequate notion of the combined scope and experience of the Group and the degree to which some investment in research and dissemination projects with such a group could be expected to be quite timely and productive.

Members of the International Educational Exchange Liaison Group

AACRAO (American Association of Collegiate Registrars and Admissions Officers)
AFS International/International Programs
AMIDEAST (America-Mideast Educational and Training Services)
African-American Institute
American Council on Education
College Entrance Examination Board
Committee on Scholarly Communication with the People's Republic of China
Council of Graduate Schools
Council on International Educational Exchange
Experiment in International Living
Fulbright Alumni Association
Institute of International Education
International Research & Exchanges Board
LASPAU (Latin American Scholarship Programs of American Universities)
NAFSA (National Association for Foreign Student Affairs)
Youth for Understanding

Each member of the International Education Liaison Group was sent a questionnaire which probed these central areas:

1) The types of information regularly collected by each organization;
2) Past or planned research;
3) Ability to retrieve, by name, alumni of exchange programs;
4) Listing of the type of data which would be responsive to questions raised by policymakers and funding agencies, including the federal government; and
5) Extent to which each organization could contribute to research.

Even a cursory glance at the returns to the questionnaire suggests that there is a substantial willingness to contribute data, ideas, and staff time to increased exchanges research. That is the "good news." The "bad news" is that few if any donors have shown an inclination to support research activities, let alone dissemination efforts. Also, as the IEELG group assesses its overall R & D needs, these will break down along various sectoral lines. Thus, the American Field Service and Youth for Understanding will, by necessity, be concerned with high school-level students and with schoolteachers, whereas the American Council on Education, or Council of Graduate Schools will be eager to examine collegiate and/or graduate-

level practices and faculty development.

The central point to be made here is that an agency such as the National Institute of Education, which has long labored in the R & D vineyards at all sectoral levels (primary/secondary, collegiate and non-collegiate post-secondary) can assist proposers to make the necessary sectoral and methodological discriminations which would enable the IEELG or any other omnibus group to define more adequately a composite research agenda which the Institute as well as other donors could subsequently appraise and support.

Returning to the promise of the IEELG effort, at this moment, the IEELG research project will, if funded, perform these necessary tasks:

1) review existing data and research;
2) identify the specific questions raised both by educational exchange agencies and by their funders regarding the personal and social value of exchange; and
3) determine priority research needs in the field.

The initial study, it is hoped, will provide the basis for the second phase of the project: seeking research support in the priority areas identified, and publishing and disseminating the results in a continuing series of monographs on the impact and effectiveness of educational exchange.

A third initiative in support of improving research and general information about international exchange is located within the International Communication Agency in a small unit charged with coordinating U.S. Government exchanges policy. More a data collection and analysis unit than a research or evaluation effort per se, this office has made some progress in the design of computer-readable data forms which are being collected and assessed.

Given the scope and importance of federally supported exchanges, the work of the International Communication Agency represents a data source of some significance to researchers and practitioners alike. It is not generally known that several dozen U.S. federal agencies are heavily involved in either sponsoring or receiving international exchangees. Despite the fact that federally sponsored programs represent only 5% or so of the total activity, this 5% embraced some 39,000 individuals at an estimated cost of $662 million in fiscal year 1977. According to the General Accounting Office, the total number of nonmilitary and nontouristic international exchanges in 1977 was estimated to be over 1,000,000. Estimates for fiscal years 1978 and 1979 reveal that six major agencies (Action; Agency for International Development; Department of Defense; International Communication Agency; Department of Education; and the National Science Foundation) continued their sizeable exchange-related programming:

	Participants	Amount(Millions)
FY 1978	37,969	$835.8
FY 1979	37,487	$706.5

Federal policy questions can legitimately be the subject of research. Some questions which merit further analysis:

- Given shrinking U.S. federal support in real terms, should the Fulbright Program be continued in all 120 countries or should resources be invested in fewer countries to maximize impact? What constitutes "impact"--variables? hypotheses?
- Is the length of stay a factor inhibiting recruitment of quality candidates for Third World programs? Can short-term exchanges be designed to achieve overall objectives?
- Is technical assistance an appropriate activity to conduct under the Fulbright Program? Is quality lowered if the Program provides manpower for Third World universities? What is the experience of the DAAD or the Inter-University Council in this regard?
- What "proof" of positive effect and impact of the Fulbright Program can be acquired through more methodologically sophisticated research which could, in turn, be used for advocacy purposes? How can research document achievements in a manner which can improve the management of the Program and convince the U.S. Congress of its continued worthiness?

Such convincing may well be necessary, given the long-term erosion of funds and the reality of current federal budget cuts. Since the sixties, in all fields of activity related to international education, research, and exchanges,

indicators of decline of funding abound. Advanced foreign area research funds and NDEA Title VI funds are deeply off in constant dollars; Peace Corps volunteer numbers barely reached 6,000 in 1979 compared with the 15,000 characteristic of the mid- to late-sixties. The Fulbright Program currently operates at 60% of 1965-dollar levels.

But evidence of decline, without analysis as to the impact of previous activity, will not produce new federal investments in exchanges. Trends need broader analysis, in all fields of international endeavor related to scholarship and technical assistance, foreign students, study abroad, and the like. Disciplinary analysis and analysis by geographical region are needed in order to assess where existing, let alone new funding would be most wisely targeted by both the public and private sector donors.

So that the field may survive, grow, and prosper in the eighties, better back-up data, research and analysis rather than tired rhetoric will not only be welcome, it will be required to set exchange priorities. Financial resources, whether public or private, cannot be expected to be adequate to match overall demand.

Closing the research and dissemination gap among principal agencies and between federal policymakers and administrators and their private sector counterparts can, if modestly and creatively handled, enrich the dialogue and experience of both camps.

IV. Some Possible Research Topics and Necessary First Steps

The development of an exchanges-related research and dissemination capacity at the National Institute of Education represents a most welcome federal initiative which can build upon the efforts mentioned throughout this paper.

Specifically, and once again echoing Michael Flack's recommendations, there are immediate, practical, operational tasks:

- the preparation and publication of a roster of scholars that have done quality research within the past decade on international educational exchanges.
- the development of a systematic publication program of outstanding theses and dissertations dealing with issues and problems of international educational exchange. Where indicated, translation into and from other languages would be desirable.
- Establishment of a modest clearinghouse on Research and Development in Exchanges which could help practitioners identify studies pertinent to their particular interests and/or problems.
- the maintenance of a roster of journals, on a worldwide basis, which have a primary focus on international and intercultural exchanges.
- the funding of specific research projects and the possible funding of a limited number of Centers of Research on Educational Exchange.

Questions which can be translated into hypotheses and subjected to methodologically sophisticated analyses are so numerous that no general overview paper can do them justice. Nonetheless, some illustrative questions for research can be provided so as to frame an agenda for future research.

A. Study Abroad: Collegiate Level

American students studying abroad are a relatively common sight in some selected European countries at least. According to Barbara Burn's Expanding the International Dimension of Higher Education:

> In 1973, the most recent year for which worldwide figures are available, .700,000 students were studying in countries other than their own, accounting for 2% of all enrollments in higher education. Students from the United States constituted the largest group, although they represented only 0.3% of American college and university students.
>
> The following figures show the number of American students studying abroad in recent years:

1962	12,500
1970	25,000
1973-1974	33,500
1975	70,000
1977-1978	120,000[6]

Burn goes on to note that these figures are probably on the low side as only students in organized programs are included. In 1978 alone, some 596,660 passports were issued to "students" according to passport application forms. Formally speaking, in 1979-1980, there were 804 U.S. college-sponsored academic-year-abroad programs, while 904 summer programs were offered in 1979.

At regional hearings of the President's Commission on Foreign Language and International Studies, at national meetings, and in numerous articles, these questions are typically raised -- questions where research can be most helpful in seeking solid answers:

- What language requirements are indicated for Americans participating in study abroad programs? What minimal standards re: foreign language competence can be designed?
- What is necessary and desirable re: accreditation of study abroad programs?
- Where have colleges and universities been successful in integrating the foreign study experience of students into the students' overall educational program?

- How can study abroad programs be diversified geographically (to Third World nations) and by discipline (to pre- and professional school students)?
- How can the returning student be utilized as a learning resource for other students who have not had the same study abroad opportunity?
- How does study abroad influence a student's cross-cultural communication skills? language skills? maintenance of such skills and contacts over time?
- What models of study abroad programs are the most cost-effective? What programs provide financial aid and how?

- What has been the experience of American minorities in study abroad programs? How critical is the equity dimension to the exchange question (e.g., who has access: women, minorities; older students; students at a limited number of institutions)?
- What motivates students to choose to study abroad? What inhibits other students from participating in such programs (money; fears for job security; negative attitudes about other peoples; lack of foreign language ability; etc.)?

B. Study Abroad: School-Age Level

International student exchanges at the secondary level represent only a fraction of the total number of all education exchanges, but it is generally believed, and with some justification, that these high school exchanges have a lasting personal impact.

In 1978, approximately 9,000 foreign students in the United States were of high school age. Two programs, the American Field Service and Youth for Understanding sponsor the bulk of such exchanges, with a range of other organizations making up the difference (e.g., Experiment in International Living; Rotary; etc.). Approximately 2,000 American high-school students were studying abroad for a full academic year ... a small fraction of the total high-school-age population. There are, of course, many summer and other short-term programs, and an accurate account of all such

activity does not generally include individual ad hoc programs.

Research could probe whether or not the purposes of international youth exchanges are being met; to wit:

- Do such exchanges enhance personal development? Cognitive skills? Intercultural skills? Self-confidence?
- Do these students develop lasting interpersonal relationships with people from another society?
- Do international experiences fuel a desire for more international travel and involvement? For more voluntary work? Affect career choices?
- Do high schools utilize returning students and foreign students in a positive way? Does the presence of such students affect the curriculum?
- What personality types and traits are reliable predictors of success in youth exchanges?

C. Graduate and Faculty Exchanges

Graduate and faculty exchanges continue to represent one critical mechanism which assures that the modern American college and university is a more cosmopolitan institution than it might otherwise be without such travel and research options. Nonetheless, the decline of research and travel funds from both federal and foundation sources restricts opportunity to a relatively small percentage of faculty members from a rather limited number of institutions drawn from a somewhat narrow band of disciplines and concentrated in specific countries.

According to Barbara Burn, "a reliable quantitative statement of the number of American academics who spend time abroad in a given year is impossible. Ten years ago, this figure was estimated at 6,500 or only 1% of all college and university faculty ... If, in the course of a 40-year career, every American faculty member were able to spend one semester abroad every ten years, this would require a fivefold increase in the number of faculty going each year and a quadrupling of the number doing so under the Fulbright program."[7]

Burn goes on to remark that the impact of faculty exchanges is difficult to evaluate because of the problem of selecting criteria, much of which is not amenable to quantification. Once again, the lack of systematic records (as mentioned by Robin Winks in a 1977 study), plus methodological innocence inhibits research in this area.

Postsecondary policy and organization issues are inevitably related to the following researchable questions. It would be useful if the National Institute of Education's existing post-secondary research agenda and research area plans could include at least the most compatible of the following matters which could be addressed by researchers:

- At what point in and in what particular fields of graduate education is an exchange experience most productive re: the training of language and area faculty?

- What motivates/creates barriers to mid-career faculty exchange?
- How does an international teaching and research experience get translated into the curriculum upon the return of the exchangee?
- How can exchanges be designed more deliberately to stem attrition of language and area skills of U.S. faculty?
- Is true transnational collaborative research occurring and if so, where and under what conditions?
- How are faculty and administrative careers affected by an international exchange experience?
- How can equity and access be enhanced at both the institutional and individual levels, in line with Burn's observations?

D. Foreign Students in the United States

Surely the most prolific pens have been placed in the service of examining this final and most complicated exchanges dimension--the foreign student. The population of foreign students in the United States, while a small percentage of U.S. higher education enrollments, does, nevertheless, number over 250,000, a fivefold increase in the last two decades.

There are several critical imbalances in the foreign student area. First, students come predominantly from a limited number of countries. Notably among the top 25 countries which account for 76% of all foreign students are the OPEC nations, a veritable petrodollar scholar holler. Second,

most foreign students--close to 80%--pay their own way. As such, foreign students represent an "invisible export" which strengthens America's balance of payments situation by an estimated one billion a year. Overall, then, despite increases in the numbers of foreign students coming to the United States, the number of students from the non-affluent three-quarters of the world's population is leveling out or is actually declining.

In 1978, close to 11% of all U.S.-earned doctorates were awarded to foreign students, and in some departments, graduate students represent over 50% of the enrollments. In some engineering fields, in particular, the presence of such large numbers of foreign students has raised difficult questions at the institutional, state and even national level. Given the heavy concentration of foreign students from certain countries, their uneven distribution throughout the country, it should come as no surprise that even more difficult times may lie ahead with state legislators and taxpayers.

On the international level, the truly sticky problems relate to the questionable ethics of some "head hunting" recruiters who charge a stiff fee for facilitating U.S. college admission for foreign students. Some U.S. institutions, facing declining enrollments, often recruit foreign students without prior consideration to the provision of adequate campus services or of an educational program appropriate to the foreign student's needs.

With the number of foreign students increasing at a rate of 12% to 16% a year, and with the expectation that by 1990, foreign students will reach 10% of all U.S. higher education enrollments, attention to better record-keeping, data analysis, research and dissemination must increase.

Several recent surveys deserve brief mention before concluding with some suggested areas for further research.

The National Association for Foreign Student Affairs (NAFSA) and the Council of Graduate Schools, with financial support from the Agency for International Development, recently completed an informal survey of faculty members of graduate institutions in the U.S. Responses were received from 44% of the 93 institutions surveyed, and represented four faculty groups: engineering, physical sciences, professional schools, and social sciences.

The findings revealed that about one-third of the faculty felt that students from developing countries were unable to articulate their special academic interests relating to their projected professional work back home; two-thirds felt this happened occasionally, and a significant 27% indicated this occurred frequently. In attempting to identify areas of difficulty which the faculty expected their students to encounter in applying knowledge back home, the most common problem identified was lack of adequate equipment and technical facilities (32%).

In questioning the changes that faculty had been willing to make in order to make the graduate program more relevant to the students from developing countries, 42% indicated a willingness to change thesis topics; 48% had been unwilling.

About 40% of the faculty permitted their doctoral students to conduct doctoral research in their home countries. However, 65% of the faculty responded that if major practical problems could be resolved, they would be receptive to having the research done in the home country, while only 18% said they would not.

Another study was initiated in 1978 at Iowa State University to assess the needs of foreign students from developing nations who were studying in academic degree programs at U.S. colleges and universities. Funding from the Agency for International Development was contracted through NAFSA to the Department of Sociology and Anthropology at Iowa State University.

A multi-stage cluster sample with probability proportionate to size was used to select schools and students in the U.S. Nearly 1,900 students responded to the questionnaire, a sample representing the population of approximately 134,000 students at U.S. universities and colleges whose foreign student enrollment was 300 or more. The survey population embraced students from 102 nations.

The questionnaire included approximately 150 items pertaining to both academic and nonacademic needs, goals that brought these students to the U.S., and linguistic needs.

Briefly, the survey revealed that financial needs and educational goals were more important to students than other needs. These were followed by needs relevant to the future of the students, i.e., finding a job, work and practical experiences, training for knowledge application and need for professional materials upon returning home.

Finally, in 1978, the National Association for Foreign Student Affairs conducted an additional survey designed to measure the impact of foreign students on U.S. communities and campuses. The need for a follow-up study is being explored given the lack of scientific methodology and the great inconsistencies which appeared in responses to the initial survey.

Based on previous, current and proposed activities, some possible promising areas for research on foreign student matters would include, but not necessarily be limited to these:

- An assessment of the impact of foreign students on the U.S. economy.
- Cost/Benefit analyses of the foreign student impact by field of study and types of institutions.
- Analysis of the most recent trends of the "Brain Drain" so as to indicate which individuals and nations are most vulnerable.

- Assessment of the likely impact of rising tuition costs in European nations on future U.S. enrollment pressures.
- A comparative analysis of the effectiveness of training in the U.S. vs. Third World countries. There is very little information about approaches, experiences, curricula, successes and other aspects of foreign student experiences in Western Europe, the Soviet Bloc nations and elsewhere.
- An investigation of the range and nature of problems and attitudes of U.S. faculty vis-à-vis different nationality groups of foreign students.
- Analysis, by field, of the utilization of U.S. education after return to the home country.
- Assessment of the importance of such variables as the size of the community and campus, geographic location, extent and quality of campus and community services and others on the success or failure rates of foreign students in America's schools and colleges.
- Experimentation on campuses designed to assist American students to benefit from the presence of foreign students on the campus in foreign language and international studies.
- Compilation and extension of the very useful studies on foreign students and test performance, such as those undertaken by the Educational Testing

Service (ETS). Test development--such as the Multinational Aptitude Test being undertaken by ETS--is a related area which while dealing with foreign students per se advances the general state of the art in testing and measurement.

V. Some Concluding Comments and Recommendations

As Anderson observes in his paper in this series, there is a need to construct a conceptual map of international education as a research domain and to develop an agenda for cumulative research over time. The range and types of desirable research outlined in this and other papers, as well as research areas which will be developed over time, need to be organized and placed within an overall conceptual framework. Without the development of such an agenda, research will not be cumulative nor will its potential be realized in practical ways.

The National Institute of Education, through its new Congressional mandate, becomes a most-needed nerve-center of activity related to research and dissemination in the exchanges field.

Within the federal government itself, scores of agencies are involved in exchange-related programs. These agencies generally do not undertake research and evaluation related to their considerable exchanges programming. The National Institute of Education, working with the Agency for International Development, the International Communication Agency,

and with others can develop an NIE Research Forum, could commission specific studies, and disseminate findings in a publication series. A sampling of federally-related research needs would include, but not be limited to these topics:

- utilization of returned Fulbright exchangees and Peace Corps Volunteers as international resources at the local level.
- impact of the Teacher Exchange Program in the actual school classroom environment and content of study.
- effectiveness of the NDEA Title VI innovative grants program designed to strengthen the international dimension of both graduate and undergraduate studies. (The General Accounting Office has called for such a study.)

Specific impact criteria could be developed with the pertinent agency or administrative officers. Criteria would include, but not be limited to assessing exchanges impact on these and other grounds:

--individual career choices and career patterns over time.

--institutionalization of international programs (hard money support; hiring and promotion practices; in-service training; curricular innovation; pedagogical approaches; etc.).

--cooperative relationships of a sustained nature growing out of the exchange program.

While there are any number of spin-off questions based on the above, it would appear that the National Institute of Education can share its experience in evaluation of pedagogy, curriculum and the like with other agencies lacking instructional or school-based constitutencies and/or experience.

The National Institute of Education, then, can use its own staff and internal talents to stimulate cooperative conceptual as well as funding mechanisms. It should be stressed, once again, that despite their particular programmatic activities, no other federal or private agency has or will be likely to develop the capacity and experience to manage such a Research Forum, or any other major activity regarding research and dissemination on exchanges. Here, the Institute provides its "good offices" as well as dollars, and plays a catalytic not just donor role in this area. Not all "Resources" are monetary, nor is the central role of the Institute one of providing dollars in the absence of coherent leadership and purpose re: exchanges research. Coordination efforts and intellectual initiative on the Institute's part are at least as valuable as monetary incentives in a fragmented professional universe.

Overall, then, there are promising and also necessary research questions which the National Institute of Education can choose to promote related to research on exchanges.

Many of the Institute's functions will revolve around the difficulty of advancing the state of the art of research and improving the degree to which exchanges can be applied to enhance educational objectives. NIE may wish to undertake an exploration of how to link massive studies of attitudes and attitude changes to studies of behavior and behavioral changes.[9] It may fund a workshop on cross-cultural equivalences of research concepts, terminology and methodology. It may examine its existing units with an eye to infusing exchanges-related issues into ongoing Institute projects. As both a leader and a funder, the Institute may further any number of activities of direct interest and relevance to educators at all levels and to managers of all types of programs involving international exchanges.

To recapituate, then, the field of international educational and cultural exchanges could benefit, and dramatically so, from the emergence of the National Institute of Education as a catalyst and donor in this field. By supporting quality research, the state of the art would be immeasurably advanced. By building upon proven recent efforts, both scholars and practitioners will benefit from the serious professional attention being applied to their activities.

As an Existentialist would argue, if the National Institute of Education did not "exist" in the international

exchanges research field, something like its new mandate would have to be created out of intolerable need. Comprehensive leadership and support for the many areas sketched in this and the other papers are not present, either in the public or private sectors. The National Institute of Education, which has to date not played an active role in this particular educational arena, must understand that it is the only logical show in town with respect to the federal side of the picture. Many other agencies--the National Endowments, the International Communication Agency, the Agency for International Development, the National Science Foundation, the Fund for the Improvement of Post-Secondary Education--all touch a piece of the elephant, but are truly the blind men when it comes to interpreting the nature of the beast itself.

A final point must be made, namely that the National Institute of Education will have to assess its structural and financial capacity to respond to the challenges and options raised in this overall agenda-setting exercise. If the National Institute of Education can cope successfully with administrative and Congressional matters so as to become an effective central force, it will contribute not only to improved federal collaboration, but will stimulate more serious attention to international education issues on the part of foundations, scholars and practitioners in the private sector.

FOOTNOTES

[1]Spaulding, Seth and Flack, Michael, The World's Students in the United States (New York: Praeger, 1976), p. 275.

[2]Flack, Michael J., "Comment on Issues and the State of U.S. Research on International Exchanges," unpublished paper (November, 1980).

[3]Ibid., p. 1.

[4]Breitenbach, Diether, "A Critique of Interchange Research" (Saar: University of the Saar, 1980).

[5]Spencer, R. E. and Awe, R., International Educational Exchange: A Bibliograph (New York: Institute of International Education, 1970).

[6]Burn, Barbara, Expanding the International Dimension of Higher Education (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers, 1980), pp. 70-71.

[7]Ibid., p. 92.

[8]See article by Motoko y. Lee, "NAFSA National Survey of Needs of Students from Developing Nations" in NAFSA Newsletter (Vol. 32, #4, February, 1981).

[9]Spaulding, Seth and Flack, Michael, The World's Students in the United States (New York: Praeger, 1976), p. 304.